

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

---

Louis Paul TOSCANO,

Plaintiff

v.

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL of the  
State of New Jersey, et al.,

Defendants

---

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Civ. No. 3:08-cv-3779

OPINION & ORDER

THOMPSON, U.S.D.J.

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant New Jersey Protection and Advocacy, Inc.'s Post-Judgment Motion for Injunctive Relief and Restraints [44]. The motion has been decided on the papers without oral argument. For the reasons stated below, the Court does not believe it can grant the relief sought.

Plaintiff commenced this action against Defendants on August 1, 2008. After several months of pre-trial proceedings, the parties reached a settlement and stipulated to a dismissal, which was ordered on July 7, 2009. On August 27, 2009, Defendant New Jersey Protection and Advocacy, Inc. filed the instant motion. Counsel for Defendant alleges that Plaintiff has harassed and threatened him and individuals in his office with emails and phone calls. He requests that this Court enter an order prohibiting Plaintiff from contacting him or any of the other lawyers involved in this now-dismissed litigation.

However, Defendant's motion is insufficiently specific to allow this Court to give it a thorough evaluation on its merits. All motions to the Court must "state with particularity the

grounds for seeking the order.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1)(B). This particularity requirement ensures that when a motion comes before a court, the court will comprehend its basis and have “enough information to process the motion correctly.” Registration Control Systems, Inc. v. Compusystems, Inc., 922 F.2d 805, 807-08 (Fed Cir. 1990). While Defendant has provided the Court with a certification detailing the factual circumstances giving rise to its grievance, it has not specified the legal grounds for its request. Therefore, this Court is unable to evaluate properly whether it has jurisdiction to grant the requested relief.

For the foregoing reason, it is therefore ORDERED, on this 14 day of October, 2009, that Defendant’s Post-Judgment Motion for Injunctive Relief and Restraints [44] is DENIED without prejudice.

/s/ Anne E. Thompson

ANNE E. THOMPSON, U.S.D.J.